

REMARKS

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al. (USPN #4,455,705 (hereinafter Graham)) in view of Nortman et al. (USPN #6,276,032 (hereinafter Nortman)).

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hintz et al. (USPN #6,493,899 (hereinafter Hintz)) in view of Nortman.

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paepke (USPN #5,003,659 (hereinafter Paepke)) in view of Fay et al. (USPN #2,676,758) (hereinafter Fay)) and in further view of Nortman.

Claims 9 and 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Nortman and in further view of Garcia et al. (USPN #5419015 (hereinafter Garcia)) or Hintz et al. in view of Nortman and further view Garcia or Paepke in view of Fay and Nortman in further view of Garcia.

It is believed that the independent claim (claim 1) is patentable over Graham, Paepke, and Hintz– taken either alone or in combination.

Applicant's invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward a cleaning device. Independent claim 1 specifies that the cleaning device comprises a (1) cleaning member, (2) a base plate, (3) an ergonomic handle and (4) a connector. Claim 1 further specifies that said ergonomic handle has a substantially curved top portion such that it allows a user to obtain both a firm and ergonomically comfortable grip. (See, e.g., Page 13, lines 10-15).

Moreover, Graham, Paepke, and Hintz either taken alone or in combination do not seem to disclose a cleaning device having both a detachable and replaceable ergonomic

handle that has a *substantially curved top portion* which allows a user to obtain both a firm and ergonomically comfortable grip

In the August 21, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner stated that Graham, Paepke, and Hintz do disclose a handle that has a substantially curved top portion (citing claim 1 of these patents). However, these patents do not seem to actually mention a handle that has a substantially curved top portion. For example, nowhere in claim 1 of Graham's patent is a handle that has a substantially curved top portion mentioned. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner point out specifically where Graham, Paepke, and Hintz actually discloses a handle that has a substantially curved top portion in their respective patents. For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 06-0515.

If any extension of time fees are required, the Examiner is also authorized to charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0515.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul Lim
Reg. No. 55,383

Feldman Law Group, P.C.
12 East 41st Street
New York, New York 10017
(212) 532-8585